



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,229	06/27/2003	Mohammad H. El-Haj	MSI-1559US	7545
<div>69316 7590 10/18/2007</div> <div>MICROSOFT CORPORATION ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052</div>				
			EXAMINER WU, QING YUAN	
			ART UNIT 2194	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/609,229

Applicant(s)

EL-HAJ, MOHAMMAD H.

Examiner

Qing-Yuan Wu

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10, 11, 13-16, 18, 20-26, 29, 30, 32-35 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-11, 13-16, 18, 20-26, 29-30, 32-35 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7, 10-11, 13-16, 18, 20-26, 29-30, 32-35 and 37 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7, 10-11, 13-16, 18, 20-26, 29-30, 32-35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patterson (U.S. Publication 2003/0236775) in view of Stein et al. (hereafter Stein) (U.S. Patent 5,896,495).

4. Patterson and Stein were cited in the previous office action.

5. As to claim 20, Patterson teaches a method for interacting with a target software product having user interface functionality, comprising:

executing a script that involves interaction with the user interface functionality of the target software product [abstract, lines 5-8; pg. 1, paragraph 5]; and

interfacing with a manipulation tool library to carry out at least two functions specified in the script, wherein the at least two functions include [Fig.3; 440, Fig. 4; pg. 3, paragraph 32]:

searching for a user interface object using a selectable one of a plurality of different search strategies provided by the manipulation tool library [pg. 3, paragraph 37].

6. Patterson does not specifically teach event handling for executing a callback function upon the occurrence of a specified event caused by a firing of the user interface object, the callback function executing a prescribed function upon the occurrence of the specified event. However, Stein teaches executing a callback function upon occurrences of an event caused by a firing of a user interface object and as a result the callback function executing a prescribed function (i.e. sending a new message as a result of receiving an acknowledgement from the GUI program that it is ready to process a new message) [Stein, col. 5, lines 1-22 and 43-56; col. 2, lines 15-57]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have modified the teaching of Patterson with the teaching of Stein because the teaching of Stein can further enhances the teaching of Patterson by properly addressing the synchronization issue with GUI testing as being considered by Stein [Stein, col. 2, lines 39-57].

7. As to claim 21, Patterson as modified does not specifically teach interfacing with the target software product using a window-type interface and an accessibility interface. However, Patterson disclosed interfacing with the target software product through the graphical user interface objects and their underlying control functionality [pg. 2, paragraph 29, lines 1-4; pg. 3, paragraph 37, lines 3-5; pgs.3-4, paragraphs 38-42]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have modified the teaching of Patterson to include interfacing with the target software product using various interfaces because Patterson's disclosure of interfacing with user interface objects would applied to various interfaces which implicitly interacts/interfaces with the target software.

8. As to claim 22, Patterson as modified teaches wherein one of the selectable search strategies is an SQL-type query string search strategy that involves comparing a specified string with information associated with the user interface object [pg. 3, paragraph 37, lines 9-21; pgs. 3-4, paragraphs 38-40].

9. As to claim 23, Patterson as modified does not specifically teach wherein one of the selectable search strategies is a flag-based attribute search strategy. However, Patterson disclosed a unique name string that contains a predetermined set of properties of a GUI object, the properties of the GUI object in the unique name are organized such that it is easy to extract the property names from the string name of the GUI object, and determine the closest matching GUI object based on the properties matched [pgs. 4-5, paragraphs 49-63]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that the teaching of Patterson involves the comparison of various attribute value and flag information.

10. As to claim 24, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 22 and 23 above.

11. As to claim 25, Patterson as modified teaches wherein another function of the manipulation tool library comprises event handling for blocking the execution of the script until the specified event or a second specified event has occurred within a specified timeout period [Stein, col. 5, lines 1-22; col. 2, lines 15-57].

12. As to claim 26, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 25 above.
13. As to claim 29, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 20 and 25 above.
14. As to claims 30 and 32-35, these claims are rejected for the same reason as claims 21-24 and 26 above.
15. As to claim 37, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 20 above.
16. As to claims 1-7, these claims are rejected for the same reason as claims 20-26 above.
17. As to claim 10, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1 and 6 above.
18. As to claims 11 and 13-16, these claims are rejected for the same reason as claims 2-5 and 7 above.
19. As to claim 18, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.
20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 5,640,537 to Jessen et al.

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments filed 7/26/07 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.
22. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that:
- a. The Office has not shown that Patterson or Patterson in combination with Stein anticipates or renders obvious "event handling logic configured to monitor a firing of the user interface object and execute a callback function..." as currently amended into claim 1 and other independent claims.
23. Examiner respectfully traversed Applicant's remarks:
24. As to point (a), the examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Stein's teaching of executing callback function upon occurrences of an event caused by a firing of a user interface object and as a result the callback function executing a prescribed function (i.e. sending a new message as a result of receiving an acknowledgement from the GUI program that it is ready to process a new message) [Stein, col. 5, lines 1-22 and 43-56; col. 2, lines 15-57] as cited clearly satisfied the claimed limitation. Therefore, Applicant's argument is not persuasive.
25. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qing-Yuan Wu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3776. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-6:00pm Monday-Thursday and alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISOR
EXAMINER

Qing-Yuan Wu

Examiner

Art Unit 2194